IOWA'S

Consolidated State Application May 1, 2003 Submission

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Due: May 1, 2003



U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application May 1, 2003, Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their May 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below. This list differs from the list in the Consolidated State Application form distributed in 2002 in that it excludes (1) the information that States were required to submit in their January 31, 2003, Accountability Workbooks, (2) the information States are to provide for Goal 5 (All students will graduate from high school), and (3) the information States are to provide regarding their objectives for student development and attainment of English proficiency. It also corrects an error in the application package. The 2002 application package indicated that performance targets for non-AYP indicators would be due in May 2003. It should have stated that both targets and baseline data for non-AYP indicators would be due in September 2003.

- (1) <u>Accountability Workbooks</u>. States are expected to submit any outstanding accountability workbook information at the time and in the manner previously established by the Department.
- (2) <u>Goal 5 baseline data and targets.</u> The Department is considering publishing an amendment to the Consolidated State Application regulations to require States to use the same definition for graduation rate that has been approved by the Department as part of the State's Accountability Plan under Title I, Part A of the ESEA. Therefore the submission date for baseline data and targets for Goal 5 is changed from May to September 2003.
- (3) <u>English Proficiency Objectives.</u> Since many States have indicated that they will not have objectives related to student development and attainment of English proficiency by May, the Department is deferring submission of the objectives until September 2003.

Summary of Information Required for May 1, 2003 Submission

A. ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

1. Baseline data and performance targets for the following AYP- related indicators.

<u>Performance Goal 1:</u> By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum by attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

1.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. (Note: These subgroups are those

for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(c)(i).)

- 1.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(c)(i).)
- 1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

<u>Performance Goal 2:</u> All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
- 2.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

Baseline data and performance targets for all ESEA Goals and indicators not included in this May 1, 2003, submission will be due on September 1, 2003.

2. Baseline data and performance targets for any State identified goals and indicators.

B. STATE ACTIVITES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS

Consistent with the consolidated State Application Package distributed in Spring 2002, States are asked to submit the following information by May 1, 2003:

- 1a. Evidence that the State has:
 - adopted challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1); or
 - disseminated grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.
- 1b. Detailed timeline for major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION MAY 1, 2003, SUBMISSION

- 1c. A detailed timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels.
- 1d. A detailed timeline for major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this May 1 submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is May 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this May 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims U.S. Department of Education 400 Maryland Ave., SW Room 3W300 Washington, D.C. 20202-6400 (202) 401-0113

A. ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Baseline Data for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide baseline data from the 2001-2002 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2001-2002 school year. States should provide baseline data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during 2001-2002.

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 4

Grade 4 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	Biennium Data 2000-2001 2001-2002 Baseline
All Students	72.4%
African American/Black	41.4%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	57.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	72.5%
Hispanic	49.5%
White	74.9%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	36.8%
Students without Disabilities	77.3%
Limited English Proficient	46.2%
Economically Disadvantaged	56.4%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	78.6%
Migrant	40.1%
Male	73.3%
Female	71.3%

Grade 4 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
	Biennium Data
Charlent Casan	2000-2001
Student Group	2001-2002 Baseline
All Or I d	
All Students	69.0%
African American/Black	40.6%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	52.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	65.2%
Hispanic	44.6%
White	71.5%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	28.5%
Students without Disabilities	74.6%
Limited English Proficient	38.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	52.0%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	75.7%
Migrant	32.3%
Male	66.4%
Female	71.8%

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 8

Grade 8 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	Biennium Data 2000-2001 2001-2002 Baseline
All Students	73.1%
African American/Black	37.6%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	51.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	73.4%
Hispanic	46.2%
White	75.0%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	26.8%
Students without Disabilities	80.4%
Limited English Proficient	41.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	52.3%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	79.3%
Migrant	32.6%
Male	72.6%
Female	73.3%

Grade 8 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
	Biennium Data
	2000-2001
Student Group	2001-2002
	Baseline
All Students	69.4%
African American/Black	35.7%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	48.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	67.1%
Hispanic	41.8%
White	71.5%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	25.3%
Students without Disabilities	76.2%
Limited English Proficient	38.4%
Economically Disadvantaged	49.0%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	75.2%
Migrant	27.4%
Male	67.2%
Female	71.5%

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: HIGH SCHOOL

Grade 11 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	Biennium Data 2000-2001 2001-2002 Baseline
All Students	81.3%
African American/Black	49.8%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	65.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	80.1%
Hispanic	60.2%
White	82.9%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	38.8%
Students without Disabilities	85.0%
Limited English Proficient	47.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	66.0%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	83.9%
Migrant	44.5%
Male	81.2%
Female	81.7%

Grade 11 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
	Biennium Data
01 12 21 0 22 22	2000-2001
Student Group	2001-2002
	Baseline
All Students	77.1%
African American/Black	50.1%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	58.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	77.2%
Hispanic	54.0%
White	78.6%
Other	
Students with Disabilities	28.2%
Students without Disabilities	81.1%
Limited English Proficient	32.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	60.6%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	79.8%
Migrant	33.2%
Male	72.0%
Female	81.9%

Performance Targets for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide performance targets for the percentage of students who will be at or above the proficient level in mathematics and reading/language arts on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. Three sets of charts have been provided to accommodate States' varying plans for setting annual measurable objectives, with some States having the same annual measurable objectives for all grade levels in the State and other States having separate annual measurable objectives for elementary, middle, and high schools. At the top of each set of charts, please indicate the grades levels to which your annual measurable objectives apply.

STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)

GRADES: _____4___

Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	64.0%
2003-2004 Target	64.0%
2004-2005 Target	70.0%
2005-2006 Target	70.0%
2006-2007 Target	70.0%
2007-2008 Target	76.0%
2008-2009 Target	76.0%
2009-2010 Target	76.0%
2010-2011 Target	82.0%
2011-2012 Target	88.0%
2012-2013 Target	94.0%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	65.0%
2003-2004 Target	65.0%
2004-2005 Target	70.8%
2005-2006 Target	70.8%
2006-2007 Target	70.8%
2007-2008 Target	76.7%
2008-2009 Target	76.7%
2009-2010 Target	76.7%
2010-2011 Target	82.5%
2011-2012 Target	88.3%
2012-2013 Target	94.2%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)

GRADES: _____8___

Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	63.0%
2003-2004 Target	63.0%
2004-2005 Target	69.2%
2005-2006 Target	69.2%
2006-2007 Target	69.2%
2007-2008 Target	75.3%
2008-2009 Target	75.3%
2009-2010 Target	75.3%
2010-2011 Target	81.5%
2011-2012 Target	87.7%
2012-2013 Target	93.8%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	61.0%
2003-2004 Target	61.0%
2004-2005 Target	67.5%
2005-2006 Target	67.5%
2006-2007 Target	67.5%
2007-2008 Target	74.0%
2008-2009 Target	74.0%
2009-2010 Target	74.0%
2010-2011 Target	80.5%
2011-2012 Target	87.0%
2012-2013 Target	93.5%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)

GRADES: _____11_____

Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	69.0%
2003-2004 Target	69.0%
2004-2005 Target	74.2%
2005-2006 Target	74.2%
2006-2007 Target	74.2%
2007-2008 Target	79.3%
2008-2009 Target	79.3%
2009-2010 Target	79.3%
2010-2011 Target	84.5%
2011-2012 Target	89.7%
2012-2013 Target	94.8%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
2002-2003 Target	69.0%
2003-2004 Target	69.0%
2004-2005 Target	74.2%
2005-2006 Target	74.2%
2006-2007 Target	74.2%
2007-2008 Target	79.3%
2008-2009 Target	79.3%
2009-2010 Target	79.3%
2010-2011 Target	84.5%
2011-2012 Target	89.7%
2012-2013 Target	94.8%
2013-2014 Target	100.0%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Performance Indicator 1.3

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and performance targets for the percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that made adequate yearly progress in the 2001-2002 school year, based upon the 2001-2002 school year test administration. For performance targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that will make adequate yearly progress from the 2002-2003 school year through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Title I Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress
2001-2002 Baseline	92.9%
2002-2003 Target	90%
2003-2004 Target	85%
2004-2005 Target	80%
2005-2006 Target	75%
2006-2007 Target	70%
2007-2008 Target	75%
2008-2009 Target	75%
2009-2010 Target	80%
2010-2011 Target	85%
2011-2012 Target	90%
2012-2013 Target	95%
2013-2014 Target	100%

The percent of Title I schools that will make adequate yearly progress annually until the 2013-2014 target is problematic to determine at this time since we are shifting to a new system for adequate yearly progress. After identification of schools using the new system, the state will be in a better position to make this projection. Thus, the state requests that a new submission on this projection can be resubmitted in September 2003.

2. Baseline data and performance targets for any State identified goals and indicators

If your State included any State identified goals and indicators in its June 2002 consolidated State application submission, please provide baseline data and performance targets for those goals and indicators below.

BASELINE DATA AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR STATE IDENTIFIED GOALS AND INDICATORS

Statement in June 2002 Consolidated Plan - "The IDE will submit targets and baseline data for the USDE indicators that are related to Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) which are outlined in the rules and regulations promulgated by the USDE by May 2003. The lowa Department of Education will submit targets and baseline data for USDE indicators that are not related to AYP by September 2003."

Goal 1: By 2012-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

1.1 & 1.2 baseline data listed on pp. 7-9 targets on pp. 11 - 13

Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

2.1, 2.2, & 2.3 Baseline and goals will be submitted in September 2003

Goal 3: By 2002-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Percent of classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers aggregate 94.79% "high poverty" 94.67% (this data is preliminary in nature).
- 3.2 Will report this data in our September submission as the information is collected by the Department at the end of the school year.
- 3.3 Current information base indicates that 100% of paraprofessionals in Title I targeted assistance buildings are highly qualified. Iowa is modifying its yearly Basic Education Data System to collect the required information on all paraprofessionals in Title I school-wide programs.

Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

4.1 lowa has identified 0 schools as persistently dangerous for the 2003-2004 school year.

Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

5.1 Aggregate Am. Indian Hispanic Asian Af. American White Male Female Disability '02 89.4% 61.7% 67.6% 90.9% 71.4% 90.7% 88.3% 90.62% 82.5%

lowa will report additional required subgroups when the state student management system is operational. lowa will submit performance targets for graduation rate in September 2003.

5.2 The percentage of students who drop out of school.

Aggregate Am. Indian Hispanic Asian Af. American White Male Female Disability '02 1.85% 6.64% 5.8% 1.58% 4.72% 1.61% 1.79% 1.45% 3.4%

lowa will report additional required subgroups when the state student management system is operational.

State Goal: The average daily attendance rate for elementary and middle school students for the school year 2003-2004 and by gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, and other subgroups as required by state or federal law for the school year 2004-2005.

Baseline - 95% (01-02)

B. STATE ACTIVITES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS

1a. Please provide evidence that the State has:

- adopted challenging content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1); or
- disseminated grade-level expectations for reading/language arts and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 to LEAs and schools if the State's academic content standards cover more than one grade level.

STATE RESPONSE

lowa school districts have been required to adopt challenging K-12 content standards in reading and mathematics since 1998. Each local school district developed their standards by using such resources as descriptions of knowledge and skills tested from the lowa Testing Programs and content standards developed by national subject matter organizations. These reading and mathematics standards were filed with the lowa Department of Education as part of the school district Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. A team of lowa Department of Education and area education agency staff has reviewed each Comprehensive School Improvement Plan.

The Iowa Department of Education submitted original evidence on August 23, 2000, to the U.S. Department of Education to fulfill the standards requirements of the Improving America's Schools Act.

The Iowa Department of Education issued the following directive on November 20, 2002, to school districts with regard to grade level expectations:

Grade Level Expectations (Benchmarks). Establish "grade level expectations" at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 in reading and mathematics if benchmarks for the content standards at these grade levels have not already been established. If districts utilize end-of-course assessments in their assessment system, then the district must have course-specific expectations/benchmarks for the standards. End of course assessments can only be used to document standard coverage for AYP purposes when the course is required for all high school students to pass for graduation. Districts will have to send this information to the DE with their Annual Progress Report (APR) for the 2002-2003 school year.

Additionally, the Iowa Department of Education has held numerous NCLB meetings and workshops for local districts during which grade level expectations were discussed.

1b. Please provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

lowa school districts are currently required to have challenging science standards for students. If districts have not already disseminated grade-level expectations for science for grades 3 through 8 because their standards currently cover more than one grade level, they will be required to do so by May 2006. Each school district will be required to submit evidence of these standards to the lowa Department of Education with their annual reporting requirements.

1c. Please provide a detailed timeline of major milestones for the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels.

STATE RESPONSE

- 2005-2006 All students in grades 3, 5, 6, & 7 must be assessed on local reading and mathematics standards. These grades are in addition to grades 4, 8, & 11 that are currently required in lowa by state law.
- 2007-2008 All students in grade 5 must be assessed on local science standards. This grade is in addition to grades 8 and 11 that are currently required in lowa by state law. The State Board of Education has stipulated that 5th grade will be the elementary grade within the grade span of 3-5 that will be assessed in science.
 - 1) Iowa school districts are currently using an expanded battery of Iowa Tests beyond reading and mathematics and at additional grade levels beyond those previously required by federal law and currently required by state law. The Iowa Tests assess a critical core of knowledge and skills for reading/language arts and science. This critical core is represented in the standard statements at the local district level across Iowa's 371 districts. Assessment of this core set of knowledge and skills provides educationally sound, meaningful information to determine the proficiency of Iowa students in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. Thus, Iowa school districts will continue to use the Iowa Tests at the newly required grade levels to be tested under NCLB.

1d. Please provide a detailed timeline for major milestones for setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

lowa will use the same process to establish the academic achievement levels and achievement level descriptors used by lowa districts to determine proficiency in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science for the additional grades to be tested under NCLB. These achievement levels will be comparable to the achievement levels already established for reading/language arts and mathematics at grades 4, 8, and 11 and science at the grade levels of 8 (grade span of 6-9) and 11 (grade span of 10-12). This comparability is important to determine the growth in proficiency of students from grade level to grade level in the core set of standards for reading, mathematics, and science.